

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT SEATTLE

7 KELLY A. LANDAU,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, *et al.*,

11 Defendants.

Case No. C18-0290RSM

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

13 On February 27, 2018, *pro se* Plaintiff Kelly Landau filed a Complaint against the United
14 States and numerous current and former government officials, as well as against several non-
15 governmental individuals. Dkt. #3. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed *in forma*
16 *pauperis*. Dkt. #2. Summons have not been issued.

18 In her 61-page Complaint, which appears to actually be two combined Complaints,
19 Plaintiff raises numerous allegations of violations of federal statutes all appearing to be based on
20 her belief that the government has been secretly surveilling her through a microchip implanted
21 in her tooth and through surveillance equipment installed on or in her various homes. *See* Dkt.
22 #3. It is not clear from the Complaint how each individual Defendant is alleged to be involved,
23 but Plaintiff appears to assert that they are all acting in concert as “the United States
24 Government.” *Id.* Plaintiff alleges a host of injuries as a result.

26 Accordingly, on February 28, 2018, this Court directed to Plaintiff to show cause why
27 her complaint should not be dismissed as frivolous or malicious, as failing to state a claim on
28

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

PAGE - 1

1 which relief may be granted, or for seeking monetary relief against a defendant who is immune
2 from such relief. Dkt. #4. In response, Plaintiff filed three documents: 1) an “article” about mind
3 control that appears to have been written by Plaintiff (Dkt. #5); 2) a 100-page “article” about
4 mind control written by a “Deb Chakraborty”; and 3) a “resolution” and letter written by Plaintiff
5 regarding “COINTELPRO” (Dkt. #7).

6 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B) the Court shall dismiss an action if at any time it
7 determines that the action is frivolous or malicious; fails to state a claim on which relief may be
8 granted; or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. After a
9 review of the Complaint in this matter, along with Plaintiff’s responses to the Order to Show
10 Cause, the Court believes that Plaintiff’s action falls within all of these categories. Nothing in
11 Plaintiff’s responses demonstrate a federal cause of action or describe any specific acts by the
12 named Defendants.

13 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s claims are DISMISSED, and this case is now CLOSED.

14 The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order via U.S. Mail to Plaintiff at the address
15 contained on the Court’s docket.

16 DATED this 20 day of March, 2018.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE